

**Strategic Prevention Framework State Incentive Grant  
(SPF SIG)  
MINUTES**

**Advisory Council Meeting  
Conference Center Room B  
November 21<sup>st</sup>, 2006**

**Deleted: Draft**

**Council Members Attending:**

Mark Frisbie, Kim Manlove serving as proxy for Billie Breaux, Hal Thompson, Tammy Loew, Laura Coykendall, Bob Levy, Jeff Barber, Dennis Wichern, Dean Babcock, Gary Williams, Louise Anderson, Celia Leaird, Cathy Boggs, Karla Sneegas proxy-Anita Gaillard, Carl Ellison for Nancy Jewell, Mike Kramer, Albert Gay serving [as](#) proxy for Heather McCarthy, Jim Noffsinger, Paula Parker-Sawyer, Matt Strittmatter, [and](#) [Cassandra Porter with Celia Leaird](#)

**Attending Staff Members:**

David Bozell, Marcia French, Jeanette Grissom, Mary Lay, John Viernes, Jr., Sonya Cleveland, Harold Kooreman, Chandonna Saba, Martha Payne, Eric Wright, Sheila Nesbitt, Neal Holtan.

**Deleted:** and Cassandra Porter with Celia Leaird

**WELCOME**

Chair Mark Frisbie, welcomed council members and called the meeting to order. He apologized for his absence at recent meetings as a result of the November election. He announced the following meeting format changes:

- Only Council Members or their proxies will be seated at the main tables with staff members seated in the gallery.
- Council Members are requested to refrain from sidebar conversations.
- A “Parking Lot” will be established at each meeting for topics that are not on the current agenda.

Chair Frisbie requested that each voting member introduce themselves.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the September GAC meeting were presented for approval but were deferred to the next meeting for the lack of a quorum. One correction was noted. The minutes should reflect the ‘Center for Health Policy’.

**Strategic Plan Submission Update**

Kim Manlove reported the plan has been submitted to the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP) and is now under staff review. He stated he has received a number of recommendations from Council members and will work with the Project Team to incorporate them into the next revision of the plan. Kim expressed his thanks to all who have submitted recommendation, especially Judge Kramer, and welcomes additional suggestions from the Council. He also expressed his hope that the plan will receive approval from CSAP soon which would enable the Project Team to bring a final draft before the Executive Committee and the GAC for endorsement.

## UPDATES

### Project Staffing

Kim Manlove informed the council that he has received the approval to begin the search for an Administrative Assistant.

A CSAP Project Officer (PO) for the Indiana SPF/SIG has still to be appointed.

### SEOW REPORT

Eric Wright reported on the process establishing the Priorities for the state of Indiana. He also stated that the charge for the SEOW was to list and analyze the data, determine the priorities as dictated by the data and lay the foundation for potential applicants of the grant. He explained that with the way the strategic plan is laid out that any applicant has the opportunity to chose from any or all of the 6 identified priorities and create a case to support their application, or focus on proving the need for building capacity. Each individual county will have access to all the data contained within the Epi Profile, in addition to supplemental maps and tables that will be available before the end of the year. Each applicant will also be encouraged to look within their community to enhance and make the argument for being a sub-recipient. The burden of proving the need for grant funds will rest on each applicant community. Paula asked if a community would be penalized if they didn't use the Epi-Profile data. Eric explained that would not be the case and that the communities were strongly encouraged to provide other local data to support their assessments. He emphasized the importance of demonstrating their case with emperial data and evidence.

Deleted: that

Deleted: -report has

Deleted: , and in addition is

Deleted: case

Deleted: be laid upon each community applying

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: i

Tammy asked if it was ok to share the Epi-report with others and are the legislators being given copies of the report. The report is a public document and can be shared with anyone, although there are a limited number of copies printed. Eric suggested the website of the Center of Health Policy as the referral source. She also asked about line within the draft tables distributed at the meeting that were blank, and he responded that they were typos and it is still a work under construction and hyperlinks will be included.

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: his report

Louise asked if there are no indicators in the boxes does this indicate that the counties fall below the 50 percentile. Eric indicated to the affirmative. Bob asked if it would be possible to color code county maps. That this is provided with maps and tables. Jeff asked if the communities would be receiving assistance in gathering data beyond that provided in the report. Eric stated that the PRC was a resource they could use but he and his team would not be available to assist each community in tracking data.

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: ¶

Eric also shared that in terms of unit of analysis they focused on counties and were not able to include individual towns or smaller units. It was purposely vague so each community could self define. He stated that a strategy for communities will be to encourage them to follow the same logic the SEOW did, find the data and make a case for the community. He suggested that the community start with the consequence and work backwards as they work the SPF process.

Mike Kramer suggested that one area of difficulty will be that there is a huge variation from county to county in data resources and this will leave for strong limitations, but acknowledged doesn't know how that problem could be dealt with. Eric agreed and stated on of the beauties of the SPF process is it helps identify weaknesses and works towards moving to evidence-based problems and solutions. Low capacity communities will struggle more and when an expert panel was polled they identified 2/3 of the counties were low capacity. One of the main purposes of this grant is to address that and build the capacity within the state. He also explained that they will be taking a sampling of key informants within communities to do annual assessments. There are two views of capacity; community readiness and organizational readiness and they are going to focus on overall capacities of communities.

Deleted: ¶

Eric concluded with apologizing for the typos in the report and then asking that people hold off distributing the report until it is cleaned up. Mark shared that it is expected the numbers will change due to increased data submissions-emphasizing that with an increase in awareness, it is possible to perceive that we're doing a less effective job, but the reality is that increasing awareness has the ability to increase the reporting even if progress is being made and numbers are decreasing. Eric acknowledge that this is likely to be a problem in all epidemiological data and that it is important to remember the lag time in reviewing any data reported and how it might affect data validity. Every data source has its weaknesses and strengths and there is no perfect data. The best results come from using multiple indicators which will lead to greater confidence with regards to validity. Drug trends are cyclical and we need to be flexible.

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: ¶

Deleted: shared this to be true

Deleted: a

Deleted: is also an issue

Deleted: the

Deleted: to it

### **Finance Workgroup**

John Viernes reported that there was a \$128.00 charge for payroll deduction that was not clear and he would investigate this and report back. He also reported the charge of \$16,500 that will be reported on the next report for the printing of the SEOW reports. The first copies printed will need a logo attached representing FSSA. The new copies have that already printed on. A concern was raised by Bob Levy regarding printing cost. John Viernas reported that the State Procurement Office required they be produced using state resources.

Deleted: how expensive the second set of copies ran.

### **Evaluation Workgroup**

Bob Levy began his report by circulating a survey the Executive Committee had endorsed and wanted to bring forth for the approval of the GAC. He asked that all complete the evaluation survey before leaving and that all surveys were anonymous. Bob explained that Harold would write a synopsis and each report will be shared with the chair of the committee, as well as a quarterly report that will be circulated to the GAC and Mark Frisbie.

Deleted: John reported it was reported that the state required they be copied by the contracting printer of the state, or state resources. ¶

Deleted: it f

The workgroup will also be reviewing the Strategic Plan at the next meeting. An organizational chart will be created that will include an analysis of how well units are implementing the Strategic Prevention Framework (SPF). The Evaluation Workgroup will examine each organizational unit's role and effectiveness with regard to the five SPF steps of assessment, capacity, planning, implementation, and evaluation as well as the

Deleted: Please complete the survey and give to Marcia.

Deleted: is

Deleted: eing

Deleted: with the 5

Deleted:

overarching concepts of sustainability and cultural competency. A further analysis on how well each group is interrelating and communicating will be undertaken. Sheila Nesbitt of Central CAPT announced she will be taking a maternity leave and introduced Neal Holtan who will be taking her place. The Workgroup expressed their appreciation for her considerable efforts on behalf of the Indiana SPF/SIG Project.

**Deleted:** and ...C...C... being cross examined...n...reviewed...An acknowledgment of ... leaving for ...was made and appreciation for all her efforts t...ion of... was announced. ... [1]

### **Training and Outreach Workgroup**

Paula reported the workgroup has met four times since the last GAC meeting. They have orchestrated an aggressive work plan and timetable. She reported they would be meeting next week with Access Indiana to create a webpage for SPF SIG, and are working on a website design. They are also looking at training materials specific to meeting organizational and community levels. The costs associated with the translation of materials from English to Spanish are being researched to address Cultural Competency issues.

**Deleted:** ...for ...T...concerns { ... [2]

**Deleted:** a ...made... a few options for a logo for the SPF SIG.....which will be presented t...Please feel free to email comments or concerns to Paula or Marcia. ¶ Starting... ... [3]

**Deleted:** I...the focuses...the ... and ... conferences is also...meeting ... [4]

**Deleted:** ¶ 2...An opportunity will be made available for those ...c... be faxed ... [5]

**Deleted:** to ...in ...capacity ... [6]

**Deleted:** to share identified...¶ are ...make certain...things are...getting ...aggressive ... [7]

The workgroup has identified a need for a project logo and Martha Payne (DMHA/CSAP Fellow) has been working on the design. Copies were circulated to the Council. The logo will next be submitted to Dennis Rosebrough, FSSA Director of Media, for approval. Additionally, beginning December 31<sup>st</sup> a monthly newsletter will be distributed on-line to keep people informed on the progress of the SPF SIG Project.

**Deleted:** Mark reported that he has begun deliberations responsible for getting this workgroup up and running. He shared that the DOA requires that the group be state employees for scoring members. He suggested that we pull from both the GAC and the Governor's Commission for Drug Free Indiana and ascertained that the members of state employees were the same for both organizations; John von Arx, Paula Parker-Sawyers and Jeff Barber. He is looking to have about 7 reviewers and stated the GAC will make the final decision on recipients. University employees can sit on the workgroup but wouldn't be able to score the applications. Paula offered her staff that have expertise in knowing what to look for and do this often. A recommendation was made to split the reviews between capacity building reviews and program implementation reviews. It was mentioned that the federal grants are required to follow the logic model and the skill sets of that are vital to know how to review logic model processes, those organizations that are currently skilled in that area are FSSA, FBO, and State Department of Health.¶

The process of identifying curriculum of Training of Trainers (TOT) programs, reserving dates and locations for the trainings are well underway. January 29<sup>th</sup> has been tentatively scheduled for the first training predicated upon the approval of the Strategic Plan.

The website will be no longer than two pages with news, short stories and links. Communities who don't have computer access will be able to have copies faxed to them. Marcia is organizing a meeting to coordinate efforts for the assessment tools that will assist communities in identifying their readiness and capacity levels.

Mark will be creating a core group and please email Mark concerns. One shared concern was that the core group being organized from other organizations was not the most beneficial way to ensure competency levels and fidelity to the SPF SIG Process. Mark agreed the SPF SIG process was of vital concern but that we needed to also be attentive to building bridges of dialogue and working collaboratively with others. ¶ Also we discussed the number of anticipated respondents and one number offered at the SEOW was about 80 ... [8]

Please review the work plan and feel free to email Paula or Marcia with suggestions or areas of concern. The T/O Workgroup will be meeting weekly to ensure all areas are being addressed in a timely and expeditious manner.

### **Grant Review Workgroup**

Mark reported that he has begun deliberations responsible for getting this workgroup up and running. He shared that the DOA requires that workgroup members be state employees if they will be scoring the grants. He suggested that we pull from both the GAC and the Governor's Commission for Drug Free Indiana. State employees who are member of both the GAC and the Governors Commission for a Drug Free Indiana are John von Arx, Paula Parker-Sawyers and Jeff Barber. Mark indicated that is hoping to have about 7 reviewers and stated the GAC will make the final decision on recipients. University employees can sit on the workgroup but wouldn't be able to score the applications. Paula offered her staff has considerable expertise in grant review.

A recommendation was made to split the reviews between capacity building grants and program implementation grants. It was also noted that federal grants are required to

follow the logic model process imbedded in the Strategic Prevention Framework and that experience in reviewing grant applications with logic models is desirable. State organizations that are currently skilled in this area of review are FSSA, FBO, and State Department of Health.

Mark said he would be creating a core group of members who would be responsible for making recommendations of additional members. An area of concern that was noted was that if group members were drawn from other organizations it might not be the best way to ensure competency and fidelity to the SPF SIG Process. Mark agreed the SPF SIG process was of vital concern but that we also needed to be attentive to building bridges of dialogue and collaboration with others.

A question regarding the number of anticipated respondents was raised. Mary Lay reported that the first SIG Project had 17.

Jeff Barber asked that the charge of the workgroup be identified prior to the members being selected, and that perhaps the by-laws might need to be amended to accommodate the creation of this workgroups. Kim Manlove indicated that the GAC had to power to create additional workgroup at their discretion and that no further action was necessary.

### **Granting Process Discussion**

Kim reported that at the past Executive Committee meeting a request was made to review several different options for the Grant Process Review. Kim reported that after input from Jessica Robertson (DOA), Jason Hutchens (CJI) and the State Attorney General's Office the recommendation of the Project Team was to employ the Request for Services (RFS) granting process. In his review the RFS offers flexibility and greater control over the process. The GAC and the Project Team would have the option of whether or not to hold a pre-bid conference, and include MB/WBE or Buy Indiana. Paula Parker-Sawyers mentioned that the T/O Workgroup had discussed this as well and felt it would be of great advantage to offer bonus points in the area of Minority and Women run businesses.

Kim reported that the FRS would follow the format of the RFP, taking advantage of the definitions and clauses that protected the grant allocation processes. Kim reported that CSAP staff have stressed repeated that all SPF/SIG activities be as transparent as possible. He also indicated that the contracting process timeframe would not be affected by following the RFS procedure and that it would take several months to move the grants through the contracting department. Paula Parker-Sawyers suggested that getting the core contract approved would save time in that area.

### **Announcements**

There were no announcements offered up from the floor.

### **MEETING SCHEDULE**

The next meeting was announced to be January 23<sup>rd</sup> in the Indiana Government Center South in Conference Room 19, between 1 and 4pm.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**Deleted:** Kim reported that at the past Executive Committee meeting a request was made to review several different options for the Grant Process Review. Kim reported that after reviewing dialogue with Jessica Robertson, from the DOA, and Jason Hutchens suggestions that he reviewed all the advantages and disadvantages available. Kim's recommendation was to follow an RFS process. The RFS reflexes ability for the GAC to have more control over the process. It would put it in our court whether to decide to have a pre-bid conference, and decisions dealing with MBWBE and Buy Indiana. Paula mentioned that the T/O Workgroup had discussed this as well and felt it would be of great advantage to offer bonus points in the area of Minority and Women run businesses to not circumvent issues but to address all components that would be of benefit to the communities. Kim stated that using the RFS would give flexibility to deal with issues of this very nature. It was reported that we would follow the format of the RFP, taking advantage of the definitions and clauses that protected the grant allocation processes. Kim reported that the comment from CSAP that the staff was adhering strongly to was to make sure all activities were transparent and there were no concerns of anything being done underhandedly. A concern raised was to whether the dollar amount on the allocations would be changed and if the time frame would change. Kim stated no to the amount being changed based on the use of the RFS and that time would be saved. He also indicated that the contracting of the grants would not be altered but remained in the hands of the DOA and would be a multi-month process. Paula suggested that getting the core contract approved would save time in that area.¶

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Mark Frisbie.

Page 4: [1] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 9:25:00 AM
and		
Page 4: [1] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 7:30:00 AM
C		
Page 4: [1] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 7:31:00 AM
C		
Page 4: [1] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 9:25:00 AM
being cross examined.		
Page 4: [1] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 9:44:00 AM
n		
Page 4: [1] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 9:44:00 AM
reviewed		
Page 4: [1] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 9:44:00 AM
An acknowledgment of		
Page 4: [1] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 9:44:00 AM
leaving for		
Page 4: [1] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 9:45:00 AM
was made and appreciation for all her efforts		
Page 4: [1] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 9:46:00 AM
t		
Page 4: [1] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 9:45:00 AM
ion of		
Page 4: [1] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 9:46:00 AM
was announced.		
Page 4: [2] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 2:05:00 PM
Page 4: [2] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 9:47:00 AM
for		
Page 4: [2] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 9:49:00 AM
T		
Page 4: [2] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 9:48:00 AM
concerns are also		
Page 4: [3] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 9:51:00 AM
a		
Page 4: [3] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 9:49:00 AM
made		
Page 4: [3] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 9:52:00 AM
a few options for a logo for the SPF SIG		
Page 4: [3] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 9:50:00 AM
,		
Page 4: [3] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 9:56:00 AM
which will be presented t		

Page 4: [3] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 9:56:00 AM
---------------------	---------------	----------------------

Please feel free to email comments or concerns to Paula or Marcia.  
Starting

Page 4: [3] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 1:58:00 PM
---------------------	---------------	----------------------

Page 4: [4] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 2:02:00 PM
---------------------	---------------	----------------------

I

Page 4: [4] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 2:01:00 PM
---------------------	---------------	----------------------

the focuses

Page 4: [4] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 2:01:00 PM
---------------------	---------------	----------------------

the

Page 4: [4] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 1:59:00 PM
---------------------	---------------	----------------------

and

Page 4: [4] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 2:00:00 PM
---------------------	---------------	----------------------

conferences is also

Page 4: [4] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 2:03:00 PM
---------------------	---------------	----------------------

meeting

Page 4: [5] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 2:04:00 PM
---------------------	---------------	----------------------

Page 4: [5] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 2:03:00 PM
---------------------	---------------	----------------------

2

Page 4: [5] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 2:04:00 PM
---------------------	---------------	----------------------

An opportunity will be made available for those

Page 4: [5] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 2:04:00 PM
---------------------	---------------	----------------------

c

Page 4: [5] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 2:03:00 PM
---------------------	---------------	----------------------

be faxed

Page 4: [6] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 2:04:00 PM
---------------------	---------------	----------------------

to

Page 4: [6] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 2:04:00 PM
---------------------	---------------	----------------------

in

Page 4: [6] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 2:05:00 PM
---------------------	---------------	----------------------

capacity

Page 4: [7] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 2:07:00 PM
---------------------	---------------	----------------------

to share identified

Page 4: [7] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 2:07:00 PM
---------------------	---------------	----------------------

Page 4: [7] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 2:07:00 PM
---------------------	---------------	----------------------

are

Page 4: [7] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 2:07:00 PM
---------------------	---------------	----------------------

make certain

Page 4: [7] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 2:07:00 PM
---------------------	---------------	----------------------



things

Page 4: [7] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 2:08:00 PM
---------------------	---------------	----------------------

are

Page 4: [7] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 2:08:00 PM
---------------------	---------------	----------------------

getting

Page 4: [7] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 2:08:00 PM
---------------------	---------------	----------------------

aggressive

Page 4: [8] Deleted	Kim I Manlove	12/1/2006 3:51:00 PM
---------------------	---------------	----------------------

Mark reported that he has begun deliberations responsible for getting this workgroup up and running. He shared that the DOA requires that the group be state employees for scoring members. He suggested that we pull from both the GAC and the Governor's Commission for Drug Free Indiana and ascertained that the members of state employees were the same for both organizations; John von Arx, Paula Parker-Sawyers and Jeff Barber. He is looking to have about 7 reviewers and stated the GAC will make the final decision on recipients. University employees can sit on the workgroup but wouldn't be able to score the applications. Paula offered her staff that have expertise in knowing what to look for and do this often. A recommendation was made to split the reviews between capacity building reviews and program implementation reviews. It was mentioned that the federal grants are required to follow the logic model and the skill sets of that are vital to know how to review logic model processes, those organizations that are currently skilled in that area are FSSA, FBO, and State Department of Health.

Mark will be creating a core group and please email Mark concerns. One shared concern was that the core group being organized from other organizations was not the most beneficial way to ensure competency levels and fidelity to the SPF SIG Process. Mark agreed the SPF SIG process was of vital concern but that we needed to also be attentive to building bridges of dialogue and working collaboratively with others.

Also we discussed the number of anticipated respondents and one number offered at the SEOW was about 80, the first SIG reported they only had 17. Jeff asked that the role of the workgroup be identified prior to the members being selected.

A recommendation of the by-laws being amended to accommodate for this workgroups organization and charge be considered.